REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application and stand rejected. Claim 1 is the sole independent claim, with the remaining claims ultimately depending upon claim 1. The applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added by this response. It is believed that the following remarks are fully responsive to the Office Action dated **October 20, 2008**.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 4, 5, 9, and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanda et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0122018). The Office Action asserts that Kanda et al. teaches each every element of these claims, except acknowledging that Kanda et al. does not specifically recite "a gate electrode driving unit for changing a gate electrode voltage in response to a video signal". The Office Action then asserts that a person having ordinary skill in the art would recognize the switch matrix control circuit 310 of Kanda et al. to be equivalent to the gate electrode driving unit of the present invention. For this element, the Office Action cites paragraph 0121 and element 309 of Fig. 4.

The Applicants respectfully assert that Kanda et al. does not make any reference to controlling the cathode electrode so that its emissions are uniform. For example, paragraph 0121 discloses a display panel 301 driven by voltages from a high voltage supply 311. Therein a control circuit 309 controls switch matrices 303 and 304 for selecting how the voltage is too be applied. The control circuit 309 stores the electron emitting quantity Ie and also executes a two-dimensional space

filter calculation as to calculate the adjustment target value for each surface type emitting device. The Office Action also acknowledges that Kanda et al. has a switch matrix control circuit that controls the selection of switches of the switch matrix, thereby selecting which surface conduction type emitting devices voltages are applied, and how much voltage to apply.

Assuming these assertions are true, nothing in this disclosure teaches that the electron emission from the surface conduction type emitting devices of Kanda et al. must be uniform, as required by claim 1. Particularly, a person of ordinary skill would not likely ascertain the benefit of uniform electron emission from reading Kanda et al., as defined on page 3 of the Specification, lines 11-24.

As such, claim 1 is believed to be patentable, and is now in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is now in order and respectfully solicited.

Regarding claims 4, 5, 9, and 10-12 because they depend ultimately upon claim 1, these claims are believed to be patentable, and are now in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is now in order and respectfully solicited.

The Office Action rejects claims 2, 3, 6, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Kanda et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0122018) in view of Konuma (U.S. Patent No. 6,465,966). The Office Action acknowledges, with respect to claim 2 and its dependent claims, that Kanda et al. does not disclose the cathode voltage control unit charging a capacitor by a constant current and determining a cathode voltage of each pixel by controlling charging time. For this element, the Office Action cites Konuma.

Konuma, similarly to Kanda et al., teaches a field emission display, as well as a method of driving that display. Inherently, the assertion of the Office Action relies on Konuma teaching use of a capacitor. However, the term "capacitor" does not appear once in the specification or claims of Konuma. Without such a disclosure, the Konuma patent in combination with Kanda et al. fails to teach, or render obvious, each and every element of claim 2.

As such, and beyond those reasons discussed above regarding claim 1, claim 2 is believed to be patentable, and is now in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is now in order and respectfully solicited.

Due to dependence upon claims 1 and 2, claims 3, 6, and 8 are also now in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is now in order and respectfully solicited.

In view of the above remarks, claims 1-12 are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Office Action is requested to contact the applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP

Jason T. Somma
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 61,526

JTS/

Atty. Docket No. **060304**
Suite 400
1420 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 659-2930 ext. 211

23850
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE